UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/557,834	08/23/2006	Aldino Albertelli	018872.00163	6658

26712 7590 03/16/2011

HODGSON RUSS LLP
THE GUARANTY BUILDING
140 PEARL STREET
SUITE 100
BUFFALO, NY 14202-4040

EXAMINER	
CHAPMAN, JEANETTE E	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3633	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/16/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/557,834	ALBERTELLI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jeanette E. Chapman	3633	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 December 2010*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-11,13-16,18-21,24 and 27-43* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) *1-11, 13-16, 18-21,24, 27-43* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 5-8, 11, 29-30, 32-37 and 40-41 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen(6665997) in view of Lee et al.

claim 1.

Figures 7-8 of Chen shows a method comprising

a) attaching a first skin 2 to a first surface of an open cell foam 9 to form a precursor for a door, window or panel; and

b) attaching a second skin 1, figure 8 to the precursor in a separate step from step a).

Lee discloses prior to attaching the second skin the precursor 1 is modified. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify chen to modify the second skin prior to attaching the first in order to provide a means facilitating the modification of the second skin prior to attaching it to the other door elements.

claim 2.

Chen discloses a method according to Claim 1 wherein the second skin 1 is attached to a second surface of the foam 9, the second being an opposing surface to the first

surface.

claim 3.

Lee et al discloses the method according to Claim 1, wherein an adhesive 45 is used to attach the second skin 40 or 42 to the precursor. I would have been obvious to attach the skins by adhesive to provide a cohesive unit preventing dislodgment of various elements.

claim 5.

Lee discloses the method according to Claim 1, wherein, prior to attaching the second skin to the precursor, the precursor is shaped, trimmed, routed, drilled, varnished, coloured, or waxed.

Claim 7.

Chen discloses a method according to Claim 1, wherein, prior to attaching the second skin 1 to the precursor, the precursor is adapted to receive one or more fittings 7 for the door, window, or panel. See column 2, lines 57-67.

claim 8.

Chen discloses a method according to Claim 7, wherein the one or more fittings are selected from the group consisting of: a handle, a lock, a plate, a catch and a hinge. See column 2, lines 57-67.

claim 11.

The location of attachment of the second skin verses the first skin is not viewed as critical to the integrity of the door structure or has been shown to cause a problem in the door structure.

Claim 43:

Lee discloses the second element may be constructed of preformed plastic element . see column 3, lines 35-47.

claim 29.

Lee et al discloses a method according to claim 27, wherein prior to attaching the second precursor to the first precursor, the first precursor is modified. It would have been obvious to modify the method of chen to provide a facilitating means to form the door panel.

Claim 30.

Lee discloses a method according to Claim 29, wherein, prior to attaching the second skin to the precursor, the precursor is shaped, trimmed, routed, drilled, varnished, coloured, or waxed.

claim 32.

Chen discloses a method according to Claim 29, wherein, prior to attaching the second skin to the precursor, the precursor 7 is adapted to receive one or more fittings for the door, window, or panel.

claim 33.

Chen discloses a method according to Claim 32, wherein the one or more fittings are selected from the group consisting of: a handle, a lock, a plate, a catch and a hinge.

claim 34.

Chen discloses a method according to claim 27, wherein step b) is effected in a

separate step after steps a). See figure 8.

claim 35-36.

Chen does not discloses a method according to Claim 1, wherein step b) is performed at least one hour or 24 hours after step a) is not viewed as critical in that none criticality or relevancy has been shown as long as the door elements are shown to remain attached unless assumed other wise. The very fact that there is a variation in times as claims verifies that no one time or range of time is critical to the integrity of the method.

claim 37.

The location of attachment of the second skin verses the first skin is not viewed as critical to the integrity of the door structure or has been shown to cause a problem in the door structure.

.

claim 40.

Chen discloses a method according to Claim 27, at least one of the precursors further comprising a frame 3-6.

claim 41.

Chen discloses a method according to Claim 40, wherein the frame is a wooden frame.

Claims 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen(6665997) in view of Lee et al. and further in view of Jasperson.

claims 9-10

Lee does not discloses a method according to Claim 1, wherein step b) is performed at least one hour or 24 hours after step a) is not viewed as critical in that none criticality or

relevancy has been shown as long as the door elements are shown to remain attached unless assumed other wise. The very fact that there is a variation in times as claims verifies that no one time or range of time is critical to the integrity of the method.

Jasperson discloses a method according to Claim 1, wherein step

b) is performed at least one hour after step a). see 8 hours curing time in column 7 also see column 8

Claims 6, 13-16,18-19, 31 and 38-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over in Chen in view of Lee and further in view of Minke et al

Claims 6 and 31.

Chen and Minke et al discloses a glazing applied to the skin. It has been considered immaterial and irrelevant when this glazing occurs since either method gives the door's final product aesthetic appeal

Chen and Minke et al discloses one or more fittings for the door, window, or panel . It has been considered immaterial and irrelevant when this preparation for receive the fitting occurs since either method gives the door's final product of a door or handle to open and close the same.

Minke et al discloses a method according to Claim 7, wherein the one or more fittings are selected from the group consisting of: a handle, a lock, a plate, a catch and a hinge.

Claim 13.

Minke et al discloses a precursor according to Claim 12, further comprising reinforcing means 36.

claim 14.

Minke et al discloses a precursor according to Claim 13, wherein the reinforcing means is a mesh.

claim 15.

Chen discloses a precursor according to Claim 18 further comprising a frame 3,5.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Chen to include the reinforcing means of a mesh to strengthen the door structure

claim 16.

Chen et al discloses a precursor according to Claim 15, wherein the frame is a wooden frame.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Chen to include the lightweight concrete to increase the strength of the door.

Claims 18-19.

Chen discloses a method of forming a door, window or panel, the method comprising attaching a first precursor 2 to a second precursor 1, wherein each of the first and second precursors comprises a skin attached to one face of an open cell foam 9, and Jasperson teaches not to an opposing face of the open cell foam. See column 7, line 37 through column 8, line 17. it would have been obvious to include some other structure such as concrete to strengthen the door structure.

Jasperson employs concrete while plastic is claimed; though both material perform the same functions and both materials are well known in the art. One would have known to employ either material according to the time available to make the door

Claim 38.

Minke discloses a method according to Claim 27, wherein at least one of the precursors further comprises reinforcing means.

claim 39.

Minke discloses (Previously presented) A method according to Claim 38, wherein the reinforcing means is a mesh

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Chen.

claim 27.

Chen discloses a method of forming a door, window or panel, which method comprises: (figure 8)

al) attaching a first skin 2 to a first surface of an open cell foam to form a first precursor for a door, window or panel, which precursor has an exposed foam surface;

a2) attaching a second skin 1 to a first surface of an open cell foam to form a second precursor for a door, window or panel, which precursor has an exposed foam surface; and

b) attaching the exposed foam surface of the first precursor 2 to the exposed foam surface of the second precursor 1 to form a door, window or panel.

Claims 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over in Chen in view of steel

claim 28.

Steel discloses a method according to claim 27, wherein an adhesive is used to attach the second precursor 8 to the first precursor 10. It would have been obvious to use the adhesive to bond door parts together in order to provide a strong cohesive unit.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 12/21/10 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues:

In a Response thereto filed on September 10, 2009, the rejection was traversed via argument. The outstanding Office Action failed to acknowledge Applicant's arguments. Rather than presenting new grounds of rejection, the outstanding Office Action substantially repeats the rejections as allegedly being obvious over Chen, but replaced the Jasperson reference with U.S. Pat. No 3,402,520 (Lee et al.) without responding to the clear traversal in the previous Response filed September 10, 2009. Specifically, several arguments were made based upon deficiencies of the Chen reference, which Lee et al. is not cited to correct.

Response:

The new ground of rejection addressed the limitations that Chen alone did not address; for example, lee specifically addressed the added limitation of “prior to attaching the second skin to the precursor the precursor is modified.

The first office action rejected some of the claims as a 102 over Jasperson and 102 over Minke, a 103 of Jasperson in view of Chen and 103 of Jasperson in view of Chen and further in view of Minke.

The second office action rejected some of the claims as a 103 Chen in view of Lee(a new reference), some of the claims over Chen in view of Lee and further in view of Jasperson and some of the claims over Chen in view of Chen in view of Lee and further in view of Minke.

Thus there was no failure to answer the substance of Applicants' arguments renders the Office Action incomplete as to all matters, as is required by 37 C.F.R. § 1.104(b). Further, MPEP § 707.07(f) states that "[i]n order to provide a complete application file history and to enhance the clarity of the prosecution history record, ***the examiner has provided clear explanations of all actions taken by the examiner during prosecution of an application."*** (emphasis added). "Where the applicant traverses any rejection, the examiner should, ***if he or she repeats the rejection*** (the rejection was not repeated)…, take note of the applicant's argument and answer the substance of it." Id. Again the rejection was not repeated... " therefore it was not necessary for the examiner to address all arguments which have not already been responded to in the statement of the rejection."

The next Action in this case can therefore be made final.

Nevertheless, the examiner has incorporated the argument of the last response into this office action and responded to the arguments though not appropriate in view of the new ground of rejection given in the last office action not this office action.

Regarding claim 1 applicant argues

Claim 1

Claim 1 is amended herein to incorporate the features of claim 4. Claim 1, as amended, requires that a precursor is made and is subsequently modified prior to the application of a second skin. In this way, the manufacture of doors, windows and panels can be improved as described in the present application.

In the Office Action, claim 4 was rejected as being obvious over Jasperson in view of Chen. Jasperson describes a method of making composite elements. In the example referred to by the Examiner, at column 7, line 37 to column 8, line 17 of Jasperson, a composite product is made including a core having plywood on one side and a concrete coating on the other side. There is nothing in Jasperson to disclose or suggest modifying a precursor prior to attaching a second skin.

Response:

This argument is no longer appropriate in that Jasperson is not used for its teaching regarding modifying a precursor. Again, Lee, a newly cited reference as of the last office action, teaches modifying the precursor prior to attaching a precursor .

Applicant continues to Argue:

Chen describes a conventional method of making a door or panel which comprises two molded skins attached to a frame. A core material, for example a plastic foam, is filled into the frame to form the door or panel. This is a known type of method which is described at page 1, paragraphs 4 and 5, of the specification, where problems with such a method are also described.

The Examiner referred to Figures 7 and 8 of Chen as showing a "precursor", but it is respectfully submitted that that interpretation is not correct. It can clearly be seen from the description of Figures 7 and 8 that these figures show an "exploded cross section" (see column 2, lines 46 to 53 of Chen) and not a core having one skin to which a second skin is subsequently attached. Indeed it is clear, for example, from consideration of column 2, lines 7 to 16 of Chen, that the foam core is filled into the cavity between the skins.

Response:

The examiner agrees it can clearly be seen from the description of Figures 7 and 8 that these figures show an "exploded cross section" (see column 2, lines 46 to 53 of Chen) and not a core having one skin to which a second skin is subsequently attached. Indeed it is clear, for example, from consideration of column 2, lines 7 to 16 of Chen, that the foam core is filled into the cavity between the skins. Chen is cited to show the basic structure, Lee is cited to show an alternative means of construction.

The examiner agrees the claims are not t anticipated by or found obvious over the disclosures of Jasperson and Chen alone . However the claims are found obvious in view of Chen in view of Lee.

Applicant argues:

Claim 19

Claim 19 recites a kit for making a door, window or panel, the kit including a precursor comprising a skin attached to one face of an open cell foam, but not to an opposing face of the open cell foam, and a second skin that is not attached to the precursor. Claim 19

is amended herein to include the feature that the second skin comprises a preformed plastics element.

As discussed above, the Examiner referred to the example at column 7, line 37, to column 8, line 16 of Jasperson, which describes the application of a plywood layer to one side of a core, and a concrete coating to the other. There is no disclosure or suggestion in Jasperson of a precursor, as defined in claim 19, with a preformed plastics skin. Indeed, it is submitted that Jasperson teaches against such a method: it is noted that in the method described at column 8, lines 6 to 14, it is described how two door skins are applied to opposite sides of a door. This is the conventional method, for example as described in the introduction of the present application in the paragraph beginning on page 1, line 29, and ending on page 2, line 2.

Response;

Jasperson employs concrete while plastic is claimed; though both material perform the same functions and both materials are well known in the art. One would have known to employ either material according to the time available to make the door.

Applicant continues to argue:

In Chen, as discussed above, the method described is the conventional method of injecting a foam in between two molded skins on a frame. Similarly, in Minke et al., the method described relates to material being inserted into a door cavity between two door skins 18, 20. Thus there is nothing in any of the cited documents which would lead the person skilled in the art to the claimed invention.

Response:

The jasperson reference is not applied as a base reference; the reference to Lee has been cited to show the precursor modified before adding the second skin.

Applicant also argues:

Claims 18, 20, 24 and 27

Claim 18 defines a method of forming a door, window or panel in which two precursors are attached together, each precursor comprising a core having a skin. Claim 20 defines a kit including the first and second precursors, and claim 24 relates to the formed door, window or panel in the case in which the precursors have been joined using an adhesive. New claim 27 defines a method of forming a door, window or panel in the two precursors are formed by attaching first and second skins to foam. The precursors are subsequently joined to form the door, window or panel.

Response:

Jasperson teaches a precursor of foam and another of concrete attached to one another and a skin attached to one face of the of the foam. See column 7-8 as stated above. Further the jasperson reference is not applied as a 102 reference but in combination with Chen and Lee.

Applicant previously stated:

The Examiner rejected previous claim 18 as being anticipated by Jasperson. It is respectfully submitted that claim 18, as amended herein, is not anticipated by Jasperson for the following reasons. There is nothing in Jasperson which discloses two precursors, each including a foam and a skin. Indeed, as indicated above, Jasperson

teaches against the use of such precursors. In the example described at column 8 lines 6 to 17 of Jasperson, two skins are adhered to opposite sides of a single core

Response:

however, see column 7, lines 37-40 and Lee clearly teaches the above.

Applicant continues to explain:

This is the conventional method which is described in the introduction of the present application. There is nothing in Jasperson to suggest to the person skilled in the art to apply a skin to each of two foam elements as required by claim 18. Since claims 13-16 depend from claim 18, it is submitted that these claims are not anticipated by Jasperson.

Again and in response:

The Jasperson reference was not cited as a 102 alone.

Applicant continues to argue:

Claims 20 and 24 were rejected as being anticipated by Jasperson. Claims 20 and 24 contian similar features to claim 18. It is respectfully submitted that these claims are not anticipated by Jasperson for at least the same reasons as claim 18. Since claim 42 depends from claim 20 it is respectfully submitted that these claims are not anticipated by Jasperson.

New claim 27 contains similar features to claim 18. It is respectfully submitted that these claims are not anticipated by Jasperson for at least the same reasons as claim 18.

Response:

See arguments above regarding the Jasperson reference. I t is important to note that no arguments include the Lee reference because the rejections has included the Lee reference until the first office action office action

In this office action applicant argues:

Chen describes a conventional method of making a door or panel comprising two molded skins attached to a frame, wherein a core material, such as a plastic foam, is filled into the frame to form the door or panel. See col. 2, lines 6-19. Chen teaches affixing door skins 1, 2 to the rails 3, 4 and stiles 5, 6 of the door frame and thereafter filling up the internal core (or cavity) 9 of the door with polyurethane foam, or the like. On page 2 of the Office Action, the Office argues that Chen teaches attaching skins to a "precursor." (citing Figs. 7 and 8). However, as explained above, Chen teaches a conventional method of making a door where skins 1, 2 and stiles 5, 6 are filled with a core material, such as plastic foam--skins 1, 2 are not attached to a foam cell 9 as argued by the Office. While the Office cites Figs. 7 and 8 as teaching this feature, Figs. 7 and 8 are "exploded cross section" views that are intended to show the interlocking arrangement of the edge insert with the wooden stile. See col. 2, lines 46-53; col. 4, lines 27-35. Because Chen discloses manufacturing a door by constructing a panel and then filling the panel with foam, Chen fails to teach independent claims 1 or 27.

Response:

Chen was cited to show the basic structure and lee was cited to show the basic structure and the method including the precursor modified prior to attaching the skin.

Applicant also argues:

Similarly, Lee et al. is exclusively directed towards panels formed in a conventional manner, in which a foam core is formed in situ. Thus, Lee et al. fails to cure the deficiencies of Chen. As independent claim 1 includes the discussed limitations, these claims are believed to be patentable for at least the reasons discussed above. Since claims 2, 3 and 5-8, 11, 29-30, and 43 ultimately depend on claim 1, and therefore include all the features of claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are not obvious over the disclosures of Lee et al. and Chen.

Response:

The fact that lee is formed in situ does not preclude the fact that the precursor is modified prior to attaching the second skin.

Applicant also argues:

Claims 9, 10, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Chen in view of Lee et al., and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 4,312,908 (Jasperson). Jasperson describes a method of making composite elements. In the example referred to by the Examiner, at column 7, line 37 to column 8, line 17 of Jasperson, a composite product is made--including a core having plywood on one side and a concrete coating on the other side. There is nothing in Jasperson to disclose or suggest modifying a precursor prior to attaching a second skin. As a result, Jasperson fails to cure the deficiencies of Lee et al. and Chen with respect to independent claim 1. Because claims 9, 10, and 18 depend from claim 1, these claims are believed to be patentable for at

least the reasons discussed above.

Response:

Japerson was not cited to show a teaching of the precursor is modified prior to attaching a second skin; Lee shows this function and method. See above. Jasperson is cited to show the two precursors of foam and concrete attach to other with the skins attached to either side of the foam.

Applicant also argues

Further, claims 6, 7, 12-14, 27, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Chen in view of Lee et al., and further in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0200714 (Minke et al.). With regard to these rejections, the disclosure of Minke et al. relates exclusively to doors which are manufactured in the conventional manner by forming a door cavity which is subsequently filled with a gas--entrained cementitious material which is cured it~ s'itu, Consequently, Minke et al. fails to cure the deficiencies of Lee et al. and Chen with respect to independent claims 1 and 27.

Response:

Minke was merely cited to show the reinforcing means of mesh not to obviate other other elements already shown by the other cited secondary references.

Applicant further states:

Lastly, on page 9 of the Office Action, claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Chen in view U.S. Pat. No. 6,401,414 (Steel et al.). As argued above, Chen fails to teach of suggest the limitations found in claim 27. Further, Steel et

al. does not cure the deficiencies of Chen. Therefore, claim 28 is patentable over the combination of Chen and Steel et al.

Response:

Steel was cited to show the adhesive employed to attach the precursors not to cure the alleged deficiencies of the other secondary references.

Applicant argues:

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Chen. As discussed above, Chen fails to teach attaching skins to a "precursor." Thus, Chen fails to anticipate claim 27.

Response;

Chen shows illustrates skins attached to a precursor

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chapman E. Jeanette whose telephone number is 571-272-6841. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-thursday, 8:30-6:00, every fri. off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Dunn can be reached on 571-272-6670. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/JEANETTE CHAPMAN/
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 3633